



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/784,726

02/23/2004

Enrique Travieso

074869-0013

9498

20277 7590 12/22/2008  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 13TH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

ALBERTALLI, BRIAN LOUIS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/22/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/784,726	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TRAVIESO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BRIAN L. ALBERTALLI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 17 November 2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-63 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30-32, 34, 36, 44-46, 48-53, and 56-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (U.S. Patent 6,526,426), in view of Flanagan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,993,471), and further in view of Kirsch (U.S. Patent 5,855,020).

In regard to claim 30, Lakritz discloses a machine implemented method for managing language translation, comprising the steps of:

determining a portion of a website that is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

scheduling for translation at least one universal resources locator (URL) based on the portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated (the manager's console routes web site content to translation resources where the actual translation is performed, column 8, lines 7-31);

extracting one or more translatable components from each of the at least one URL scheduled for translation (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).

Lakritz does not disclose presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose method for translating web content comprising presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to present the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

Additionally, while Lakritz discloses the manager's console detects when a document in a master web database is updated (column 8, lines 4-5), Lakritz and Flanagan et al. do not disclose the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages.

Kirshch discloses a method for discovering web content that has been updated, wherein the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages (see Fig. 3, URL's are crawled to discover changed information resources, column 6, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Lakritz and Flanagan et al. to crawl an origin website to

Art Unit: 2626

detect the portions of the website that were not yet translated (i.e. the new content), because such a procedure automatically identifies new, rapidly changing resources, as taught by Kirshch (column 4, lines 25-29).

In regard to claim 31, Lakritz discloses each of the translatable components is one of a text segment (text); an image file (graphics); an audio clip (audio); a video clip (video); a file (any one of the image file, audio, or video files), and any combination thereof in an electronic data stream (column 8, lines 13-17).

In regard to claim 32, Lakritz discloses an identifier associated with each of the translatable components is generated to positively identify the document (a job ticket is created for each document to be translated, column 9, lines 15-26).

In regard to claim 34, Lakritz discloses the first language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic;

the second language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic; and

the second language is different from the first language (supported languages include English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic, see columns 51-52).

In regard to claim 36, Lakritz does not disclose if the content in the first language is formatted, at least some formatting information contained in the content in the first language is included in at least one translated component to preserve the format of the content in the first language.

Flanagan et al. disclose method for translating web content wherein disclose if the content in the first language is formatted, at least some formatting information contained in the content in the first language is included in at least one translated component to preserve the format of the content in the first language (the HTML formatting information is preserved in translated documents, see Figs. 6A-6C and column 4, lines 53-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to preserve the format of the content in the first language if formatting information were present, because this would allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

In regard to claim 44, Lakritz discloses the content in the first language is web content containing at least one markup tag (web based documents, column 8, lines 4-17; comprising HTML, column 10, lines 28-20).

In regard to claim 45, Lakritz discloses a system (column 3, lines 16-25) for managing language translation, comprising:

a content accessing unit configured to enable access to content in a first language (the manger's console accesses websites, column 7, lines 39-54);

an information processing unit (manager's console) configured for:

determining a portion of the content that is not yet translated into second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

scheduling for translation at least one universal resources locater (URL) based on the portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated (the manager's console routes web site content to translation resources where the actual translation is performed, column 8, lines 7-31);

extracting one or more translatable components from each of the at least one URL scheduled for translation (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storage configured for storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).



Lakritz does not disclose presenting the adding the translatable components for translation to a translation list separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose method for translating web content comprising adding the translatable components for translation to a translation list separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to present the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

Additionally, while Lakritz discloses the manager's console detects when a document in a master web database is updated (column 8, lines 4-5), Lakritz and Flanagan et al. do not disclose the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages.

Kirshch discloses a method for discovering web content that has been updated, wherein the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a

Art Unit: 2626

first language via following links to additional pages (see Fig. 3, URL's are crawled to discover changed information resources, column 6, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Lakritz and Flanagan et al. to crawl an origin website to detect the portions of the website that were not yet translated (i.e. the new content), because such a procedure automatically identifies new, rapidly changing resources, as taught by Kirshch (column 4, lines 25-29).

In regard to claim 46, Lakritz discloses each of the translatable components is one of a text segment (text); an image file (graphics); an audio clip (audio); a video clip (video); a file (any one of the image file, audio, or video files), and any combination thereof in an electronic data stream (column 8, lines 13-17).

In regard to claim 48, Lakritz discloses providing the one or more translatable components and identifiers thereof to a human translator for translating the one or more translatable components in the second language (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14).

In regard to claim 49, Lakritz discloses the first language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic;

the second language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic; and

Art Unit: 2626

the second language is different from the first language (supported languages include English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic, see columns 51-52).

In regard to claim 50, Lakritz discloses a machine readable medium having data stored thereon (column 56, line 1), the data, once read, causing the following:

determining a portion of a website that is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

scheduling for translation at least one universal resources locator (URL) based on the portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated (the manager's console routes web site content to translation resources where the actual translation is performed, column 8, lines 7-31);

extracting one or more translatable components from each of the at least one URL scheduled for translation (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).

Lakritz does not disclose presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose method for translating web content comprising presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to present the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

Additionally, while Lakritz discloses the manager's console detects when a document in a master web database is updated (column 8, lines 4-5), Lakritz and Flanagan et al. do not disclose the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages.

Kirshch discloses a method for discovering web content that has been updated, wherein the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages (see Fig. 3, URL's are crawled to discover changed information resources, column 6, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Lakritz and Flanagan et al. to crawl an origin website to detect the portions of the website that were not yet translated (i.e. the new content), because such a procedure automatically identifies new, rapidly changing resources, as taught by Kirshch (column 4, lines 25-29).

In regard to claim 51, Lakritz discloses a machine implemented method for managing language translation, comprising the steps of:

obtaining information related to a first content in a first language (the manger's console accesses websites, column 7, lines 39-54);

determining a portion of a website that is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

scheduling for translation at least one universal resources locator (URL) based on the portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated (the manager's console routes web site content to translation resources where the actual translation is performed, column 8, lines 7-31);

extracting one or more translatable components from each of the at least one URL scheduled for translation (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).

Lakritz does not disclose presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose method for translating web content comprising presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to present the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-

Art Unit: 2626

translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

Additionally, while Lakritz discloses the manager's console detects when a document in a master web database is updated (column 8, lines 4-5), Lakritz and Flanagan et al. do not disclose the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages.

Kirshch discloses a method for discovering web content that has been updated, wherein the detection is performed by crawling an origin website containing content in a first language via following links to additional pages (see Fig. 3, URL's are crawled to discover changed information resources, column 6, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify Lakritz and Flanagan et al. to crawl an origin website to detect the portions of the website that were not yet translated (i.e. the new content), because such a procedure automatically identifies new, rapidly changing resources, as taught by Kirshch (column 4, lines 25-29).

In regard to claim 52, Lakritz discloses generating an identifier for each of the translatable components, wherein the storing step includes storing an identifier in association with a corresponding translated component (a job ticket is created for each document to be translated, column 9, lines 15-26).

Art Unit: 2626

In regard to claim 53, Lakritz does not disclose displaying, on a graphical user interface, the one or more translatable components; and

displaying, on the graphical user interface, one or more files linked from the first content.

Flanagan et al. disclose displaying, on a graphical user interface, the one or more translatable components (Fig. 1A, text 14, column 2, lines 26-38); and

displaying, on the graphical user interface, one or more files linked from the first content (e.g. links to additional web pages below text 14, "World Community Forum", column 2, lines 26-38).

Thus, the prior art includes each element claimed, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference. One of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the conventional web page display technique of Flanagan et al. with Lakritz to provide a means for displaying the web pages of Lakritz in a conventional manner. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have recognized that the combination would predictably result in a conventional web page display of the web pages stored in the database of Lakritz.

In regard to claim 56, Lakritz discloses:

receiving a specification of the first content (the manager's console notifies a manager when a web site has been updated, column 8, lines 4-7);



adding the specification to a request list (the project analyzer creates job tickets to request the translation from translation resources, column 9, lines 1-26); and

arranging the request list based on a pre-determined priority (the project analyzer creates a project schedule for performing various translations, column 9, lines 15-32; a project schedule is necessarily prioritized by indicated the order in which jobs are completed).

In regard to claim 57, Lakritz discloses the specification of the first content is a URL (web sites are specified, column 8, lines 4-15; websites generally being referred to by their URL, see column 14, lines 1-3).

In regard to claim 58, Lakritz discloses each of the at least one URL points to either a live web page or a snapshot of a live web page (the web sites translated are live, current web sites, see column 7, lines 55-67).

3. Claims 33, 35, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al., in further view of Kirsch, and further in view of Clark (U.S. Patent 6,345,243).

In regard to claims 33 and 47, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose the identifier for a text segment is generated using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm based on one or more text segments.

Clark discloses an identifier for a text segment is generated using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm based on one or more text segments (a hash function is used to generate the unique attribute identifier for each translatable segment, column 20, lines 12-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to generate an identifier using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm, because these well known techniques provide a simple means for uniquely identifying a block of data, such as a text segment.

In regard to claim 35, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose the content in the first language includes text that is not displayed as part of the content in the first language and that is subject to translation.

Clark discloses content in the first language includes text that is not displayed as part of the content in the first language and that is subject to translation (legacy source files, representing previous versions of content in the first language, are identified and translated, column 13, line 51 to column 14, line 14 and column 14, line 66 to column 15, line 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to translate text in the first language that was not displayed, because this would allow a content manager to retain legacy files that would indicate the changes in content over time.

4. Claims 37-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al., in further view of Kirsch, and further in view of Cartus (U.S. Patent 6,993,473).

In regard to claim 37, Lakritz discloses previewing translations (human editors post-edit documents prior to completed translation, column 12, lines 23-25).

Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose the step of previewing, on a graphical user interface, a rendition of at least one translated component by displaying each of the translated components within formatted content in the first language.

Cartus discloses a method of graphically assisting a translator, comprising the step of previewing, on a graphical user interface, a rendition of at least one translated component by displaying each of the translated components within formatted content in the first language (Fig. 3C, the bolded translated component in English is displayed within the formatted content in Spanish, column 7, lines 49-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to display a preview of the translated component within formatted content in the first language, because this would allow the user to ensure the translated components corresponded correctly to the source components.

In regard to claim 38, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose the step of previewing further comprises displaying, on the graphical user interface, at least one of the translatable components.

Cartus discloses the step of previewing further comprises displaying, on the graphical user interface, at least one of the translatable components (Fig. 3C, the translatable component, i.e. the first paragraph of Spanish text, is displayed, column 7, lines 49-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to display at least one of the translatable components, because this would allow the user to ensure the translated components corresponded correctly to the source components.

In regard to claim 39, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose highlighting the at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component in a first scheme; and

highlighting the at least one of the translated components in a second scheme different from the first scheme.

Cartus discloses highlighting the at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component in a first scheme (Fig. 3B, source text which does not yet have a corresponding translated component is highlighted, column 7, lines 37-49); and

highlighting the at least one of the translated components in a second scheme different from the first scheme (Fig. 3C, the bolded translated component in English is displayed within the formatted content in Spanish, column 7, lines 49-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to highlight the translatable components that did not have a translated component in a first scheme and highlight the translated components in a second scheme different from the first scheme, because this would help the user know where to focus on the display during the translation process, as taught by Clark (column 7, lines 54-55).

In regard to claim 40, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose:  
facilitating selection of a translated component;  
simultaneously displaying, on the graphical user interface, a corresponding translatable component and the selected translated component.

Cartus discloses a method comprising:  
facilitating selection of a translated component (Fig. 3C, a user defines a target-text unit, the bolded English component, column 7, lines 51- 58);  
simultaneously displaying, on the graphical user interface, a corresponding translatable component and the selected translated component (Fig. 3C, the defined target-text unit, the bolded English component, and corresponding source-text unit, the italicized Spanish component, are displayed simultaneously, column 7, lines 49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to select a translated component and simultaneously display the corresponding translated component, because this would allow the user to ensure the translated components corresponded correctly to the source components.

In regard to claim 41, Lakritz discloses:

facilitating selection of a translated component previewed (a human post-edits a document, which necessarily requires selecting a translated component to be edited, column 12, lines 23-25);

facilitating editing of a translated component to produce an updated translated component (post editing the document, column 12, lines 23-25);

storing the updated translated component with a corresponding identifier for the translated component (the translated documents are stored back in the database, column 12, lines 35-48).

In regard to claim 42, Lakritz discloses:

displaying a reference to a file contained in the content in the first language (when a document in a master language is updated, the web site manager is notified of the document, column 8, lines 4-7);

facilitating selection of the reference file (the manager selects the file by clicking a button, column 8, lines 8-15); and

accessing the file when the reference is selected (by clicking the button, the source documents are accessed and staged down the workflow pipeline for translation, column 8, lines 8-15).

In regard to claim 43, Lakritz discloses the step of previewing is performed in a multi-user environment, in which more than one rendition of at least some of the translated components can be previewed at the same time (multiple human translators work on documents as a virtual translation team, column 11, lines 9-14).

5. Claims 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al., in further view of Kirsch, and further in view of Hargrave et al. (U.S. Patent 5,724,593).

In regard to claim 54, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose facilitating selection of a string of characters from the displayed one or more translatable components;

searching for a text segment that matches the selected string of characters; and displaying the text segment.

Hargrave et al. disclose a translation assistant tool that allows a user to perform: facilitating selection of a string of characters from the displayed one or more translatable components (column 13, lines 23-25);

searching for a text segment that matches the selected string of characters (the entered string is searched for, column 13, lines 41-67); and

Art Unit: 2626

displaying the text segment (matches are displayed for the user, column 14, lines 20-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to search for a string of characters and display a text segment matching the string of characters, because this will allow a translator to view the text segment in a variety of contexts, thereby aiding in translation, as taught by Hargrave et al. (column 14, lines 17-24).

In regard to claim 55, Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch do not disclose the step of searching is performed by fuzzy match.

Hargrave et al. disclose the step of searching is performed by fuzzy match (column 14, lines 17-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz, Flanagan et al. and Kirsch to perform a fuzzy match, because translation memories are most useful when they are able to locate fuzzy matches, as taught by Clark (column 2, lines 58-63).

6. Claims 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz, in view of Flanagan et al.

In regard to claim 59, Lakritz disclose a machine implemented method for managing language translation, comprising the steps of:



determining at least one portion of content that is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

extracting one or more translatable components from content scheduled for translation selected based on the at least one portion of the content that is not yet translated (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).

Lakritz does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server that provides the content to a user browsing a web site; and

presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a

Art Unit: 2626

web site (Fig. 8, a translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16); and

presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Lakritz, because doing so allows web content to be translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to present the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

In regard to claim 60, Lakritz discloses a system (column 3, lines 16-25) for managing language translation, comprising:

a content accessing unit configured to enable access to content in a first language (the manger's console accesses websites, column 7, lines 39-54);

Art Unit: 2626

an information processing unit (manager's console) configured for:

determining at least one portion of content that is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

extracting one or more translatable components from at least one URL scheduled for translation selected based on the at least one portion of the content that is not yet translated (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components from the translation list as translated components from a human translator (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44; translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14).

Lakritz does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server that provides the content to a user browsing a web site; and

adding the translatable components for translation to a translation list, separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a

Art Unit: 2626

web site (Fig. 8, a translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16); and

adding the translatable components for translation to a translation list, separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Lakritz, because doing so allows web content to be translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to add the translatable components for translation to a translation list separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

In regard to claim 61, Lakritz discloses a machine readable medium having data stored thereon, the data, once read, causing the following:

Art Unit: 2626

determining a portion of a website that is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

scheduling for translation at least one universal resources locator (URL) based on the portion of the content in the first language that is not yet translated (the manager's console routes web site content to translation resources where the actual translation is performed, column 8, lines 7-31);

extracting one or more translatable components from each of the at least one URL scheduled for translation (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components from a human translator (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).

Lakritz does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server that provides the content to a user browsing a web site; and

adding the translatable components for translation to a translation list, separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site (Fig. 8, a translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16); and

adding the translatable components for translation to a translation list, separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Lakritz, because doing so allows web content to be translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to add the translatable components for translation to a translation list separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

In regard to claim 62, Lakritz discloses a machine implemented method for managing language translation, comprising the steps of:

obtaining information related to a first content in a first language (the manger's console accesses websites, column 7, lines 39-54);

determining a portion of the first content is not yet translated in a second language (a manager's console detects when a web site document has been updated and requires translation, column 8, lines 4-7);

scheduling for translation at least one universal resources locator (URL) based on the portion of the first content that is not yet translated (the manager's console routes web site content to translation resources where the actual translation is performed, column 8, lines 7-31);

extracting one or more translatable components from each of the at least one URL scheduled for translation (generators convert the web document into an appropriate format for the translation resources, column 9, line 64 to column 10, line 12);

translating the translatable components into a second language using human translation (translation resources include human translators, column 10, lines 57-67 and column 11, lines 9-14); and

storing into a database the translations of the translatable components as translated components from a human translator (the completed translated documents are stored in a database, column 9, lines 40-44).

Lakritz does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server that provides the content to a user browsing a web site; and

presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL.

Flanagan et al. disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site (Fig. 8, a translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16); and

presenting the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL (HTML documents are preprocessed to preserve non-translatable components and extract the translatable components, column 3, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Lakritz, because doing so allows web content to be translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to present the translatable components for translation separately from the rest of the tags, executable code, and other non-translatable content in each of the at least one URL, because this would preserve the non-



Art Unit: 2626

translatable content in the web content, and allow the translated web content to have the same appearance and behavior as the original page, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 4, lines 3-8).

In regard to claim 63, Lakritz does not disclose the content in the first language is intercepted directly from the web server on-the-fly while the web server provides the content to the user.

Flanagan et al. disclose the content in the first language is intercepted directly from the web server on-the-fly while the web server provides the content to the user (column 5, lines 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Lakritz to intercept the content directly from the web server on-the-fly while the web server provided the content to the user, because this would allow the web content to be rapidly translated with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN L. ALBERTALLI whose telephone number is (571)272-7616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 AM to 6:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

BLA 12/18/08